

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Pending claims 9-13, 23-27, 29, 31-34 and 36-39 stand rejected under § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,675,637 (Szlam). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 9 is patentable as Szlam does not disclose a system having a storage to store a first database with a plurality of records and an application to access a telephone number of a second party to an outgoing telephone call and search the first database for a record containing the telephone number. In this regard, Szlam does not disclose a single storage that includes both a first database and an application. That is, a single storage cannot be a "combination of 10A and 13A from Figure 1" of Szlam, as contended by the Office Action. Office Action, p. 3. This is true, at least because agent station 10A and host 13A are different components and therefore are different storage devices. Accordingly, claim 9 and dependent claims 10-13 and 37-39 are patentable over Szlam.

Dependent claim 11 is further patentable, as there can be no database external to the system of Szlam, as the Office Action contends that the entirety of FIG. 1 is the "system" of Szlam. Office Action, p. 2.

With respect to dependent claim 37, nowhere does Szlam disclose a portable device to be coupled to a telephone line or a computer system. In this regard, the portion of Szlam cited by the Office Action (Office Action, p. 4) merely states that an agent station 10 may be a personal computer. However, nowhere does Szlam disclose that the personal computer is a portable device.

Dependent claim 38 is further patentable, as nowhere does Szlam disclose that such a portable device (nowhere disclosed in Szlam) further includes a printer housed therein.

Dependent claim 39 is further patentable as nowhere does Szlam disclose a portable device (nowhere disclosed by Szlam) coupled to a computer system to synchronize data between a first database and a memory of the computer system.

Regarding independent claim 23, nowhere does Szlam disclose receiving a search query in a first system, obtaining the information from the first system if it is present therein, and searching at least one remote source if the information is present in the first system. In this regard, the Office Action refers to cols. 10-11 of Szlam. However, this portion of Szlam merely states that an agent station is used to access HOST 1 and DATABASE or other information sources to obtain information. However, nowhere does Szlam disclose that the agent station receives a search query. Nor does Szlam disclose obtaining information associated with a party from the agent station. Thus, Szlam does not have a first system that receives a search query and obtains information therefrom if it is present therein. Szlam does not disclose a first system and at least one remote source, and therefore cannot anticipate claim 23, for the further reason that the Office Action contends that all of FIG. 1 of Szlam is a single system. For at least these reasons, claims 23-36 are patentable over Szlam.

With respect to dependent claim 25, the Office Action refers to columns 21 and 22 of Szlam, which relate to storage of information in either a DIALER or a separate device. However, Szlam does not disclose receiving in such a device a search query for information associated with a second party during a telephone call and providing such information back to such a device from a remote source if it is not found therein, as recited by claim 23. Thus these components of Szlam are not a first system, and claims 25 and 26 are patentable for this further reason.


Dependent claims 27 and 34 are patentable for the same reason discussed above in regard to claim 39.

Pending claims 14, 28, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Szlam in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,160,877 (Tatchell), and claim 30 over Szlam in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,188,762 (Shooster). For at least the same reasons discussed above as to claims 9 and 23, claims 14, 28, 30, and 35 are patentable over the proposed combinations.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 20, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark J. Rozman  
Registration No. 42,117  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, Texas 77024-1805  
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]  
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]



21906

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE